

N^o 19

The Christian Sabbath as Old as the Creation.

A
S E R M O N

PREACHED in the
CATHEDRAL CHURCH
OF
SAINT PAUL,
ON

Sunday, November 12, 1752.

BY
RICHARD PARRY, M. A.
STUDENT of Christ-Church in Oxford,
And CHAPLAIN to the Right Honorable The Lord VERE.

LONDON:
Printed by DANIEL BROWNE:
And Sold by R. DODSLEY in Pall Mall, L. DAVIS in Fleet-street, JAMES
FLETCHER in Oxford; and SAMUEL PRICE in Dublin. 1753.
[Price One Shilling.]



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Subject of the following Discourse is, if the Author be not mistaken, of some Importance, and deserving the Attention of those, who are Friends to *Christianity*. This he thinks a sufficient Apology for sending it abroad. The History of *Cain* and *Abel* is so closely connected with the Subject, that it ought to be considered in Print, though it was omitted, on Account of its Length, at the Delivery from the Pulpit, and is therefore inserted between Crotchets. He has nothing farther to add, than to desire those, who may be inclined to dispute any Thing here advanced, to propose their Objections with their *Names* subscribed, and they shall have, at least, a candid, if not a satisfactory, *Answer*.

I

ju
C
to
th
o
T
an
to
ci
b

ba
fl
d
w
J
fi
p

MARK ii.†27.

The Sabbath was made for Man.

IT is not the least Recommendation of reveled Religion, that as all its Parts are highly consistent with the Reason, so they are evidently instituted for the Service of Man.-----Not founded, like the arbitrary Injunctions of a Tyrant, in the mere Will and Pleasure of the *Creator*, but relative to, and calculated, graciously calculated, to relieve, the Necessities, and to promote, the Welfare of the *Creature*. And as this is true of all the Parts of Religion in general, so, in a particular Manner, of the *Sabbath*. THAT, in a more eminent Degree, *was made for* the Use and Benefit of *Man*, to withdraw his Affections from Earth to Heaven, from the Creature to the Creator; and to anticipate, as it were, that *Rest* and *Glory* here, which shall be reveled hereafter.

It may not therefore be unprofitable to consider the *Sabbath* in this View, under the *Patriarchal*, *Jewish*, and *Christian* Dispensations.——In pursuing this Design, I shall endeavour to shew, as plainly as the Nature of the Thing will admit, that the *Sabbath* was *changed*, for the Use of the *Jews*, from the *seventh* Day of the *Patriarchal* Week to the *sixth*---from *Sunday* to *Saturday*. From whence it will appear, that the *Christian Sabbath* is as old as the *Creation*.

The *Sabbath* is to be considered, in the *first* Place, as relative to the *Patriarchal* Dispensation.

MAN was the *finishing* of the visible Creation, the *last* and *best* of all the Works of God. And therefore as God created the World in *six Days*, and *rested* on the *seventh*, we might naturally expect, that he would consecrate *that seventh* for the more immediate Service of Himself, and to be offered up as the *first Fruits* of the Creature's *Time* to the Creator. Nor are we disappointed in our Expectations. For the sacred Historian informs us, that *God blessed that seventh Day and sanctified it*, (he *separated* and set it apart for *religious Purposes*) *because that on it he rested from all his Work that he had created.* *

But farther-----It is highly probable, that on *this Day* God entered into Covenant with *Adam*, and made him the first Overtures of *Life, Eternal Life*, as the Reward of his Faith and Obedience; and threatened him with *Death, Eternal Death*, as the immediate Consequence of his Infidelity and Disobedience. This seems to be intimated to us in that remarkable Expression, *On the seventh Day God ended (or finished) his Work which he had made.* (a) From whence it follows

* Gen. ii. 3. את יום השביעי illa Dies illa septima, *that Day, that seventh.* The Particle את is, like the Article ה, *emphatical.* It is put before *all Cases*, and therefore cannot be the Sign of any particular one. (Our English Word THE seems to be the Hebrew ETH inverted.) It was necessary to make this Remark, because it is alone sufficient to set aside a Conceit of some eminent Writers, that the Observation of the *Sabbath* was *first* enjoined by the *Law of Moses*, and that the Institution is mentioned *here* by Way of *Anticipation.* There is no Occasion, I think, to enter into a formal Confutation of such a wild Opinion. For the Words of Moses are express. *On the seventh Day God finished his Work which he had made; and he rested on that seventh Day from all his Work which he had made.* Then follows another Clause. *Moreover God blessed that Day that seventh, and sanctified IT;* (he *separated* and set it apart for the *religious Use* of his Creature *Man*) *because that on IT he had rested from all his Work that he had created.*

(a) Gen. ii. 2.

follows, that he did *something* on *that* Day, for *to finish* implies *Action*. And what could that be, but teaching his *Human* Creatures Religion? We may therefore infer, with the Apostle, (b) that *that* and every succeeding *seventh* Day was *separated* and set apart, for the *religious* Use of the first Pair and their Posterity, not merely as a *Memorial* of *God's resting* from the Works of Creation, but likewise as a *Type* and *Pledge* of their *own* future *Rest*, when, in Imitation of the Creator, they should have *finished* their *Works*.

This seems to have been the Use and Institution of the *Sabbath* in the State of *Innocence*. How long *that State* continued is not known; that it continued not long, is certain. It is probable, by considering the *Analogy* and *Correspondence* between the Time of the *Fall*, and that of the *Redemption*, that *Adam* transgressed on the *seventh* Day. Hence arose a *new Relation*, and consequently a *new Duty*. For *Adam* now stood, not only in the natural Relation (in which God had placed him) of a *Creature*, but likewise in a new Relation (in which he had placed himself) of a *fallen, degenerate, Creature*. A Change being thus made in the State of Religion, some *new Circumstance* became necessary to point out that Change. Hence *Sacrifice* ‡ had its Origin, and was *instituted*

(b) Heb. iv.

‡ By *Sacrifice* I mean *slaying an Animal*, and *pouring out the Blood*, as a *typical* Representation, just as we *break Bread*, and *pour out Wine*, as a *commemorative* Representation, of the *Death of Christ*. Hence we discover the *Falsity* of the Popish Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. For *Sacrifice* had the *same Object* as *Bread* and *Wine* have, namely, *Christ crucified*. If therefore the *Bread* and *Wine* be really *changed*, as the Church of *Rome* asserts, into the *very natural Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, it necessarily follows, that the *Bodies* of those *Beasts* slain in *Sacrifice* were likewise really *changed* into the *very natural Body* of *Christ*, and *their Blood* into *his Blood*. A Supposition, which will not, I presume, be readily admitted, even by *that Church*. Nay indeed, to eat and drink in *Remembrance* of a Person *present* (how smooth soever it may go down in an *unknown Tongue*) is a plain Contradiction in Sense and Terms. And this, probably, was the Reason, why our blessed Saviour, after he had *broken* ΤΟΝ ΑΓΤΟΥ ΤΗΕ (*sacramental*) *Bread*, and thereby discovered himself to two of his Disciples, *vanish'd out of their Sight*. Luke xxiv. 31.

stituted (as *Bread* and *Wine* afterwards were) as the *Sign* or *Symbol* of the *New Covenant* founded in the *Blood* of *Christ*. The *Scripture* indeed has made no express *Declaration* concerning either the *Use* or the *Origin* of *Sacrifice*. And yet *Both* seem to be strongly implied in that *figurative* Expression---*The Lord God made Coats of Skin* and cloathed them (c). It is well known, that in *Scripture* the *Habits* of the *Body* are frequently applied, with great *Beauty* and *Propriety*, to the *Mind*. *Thou hast put off my Sackloth*, says the *Psalmist*, and girded me with *Gladness* (d). And again, when he would set before us a perfect *Character* of pure and unspotted *Innocence*, *Let thy Priests be cloathed with Righteousness* (e). *Job* likewise, with his accustomed *Eloquence*, expresses himself in the same *Language*. *I put on Righteousness and it cloathed me; my Judgment was as a Robe and a Diadem* (f). *Isaiah* too makes use of the same *Figure* in his sublime *Description* of the *Redeemer of Israel*. He put on *Righteousness as a Breast-plate*, and an *Helmet of Salvation upon his Head*; He put on the *Garments of Vengeance for Cloathing*, and was clad with *Zeal as a Cloak* (g). And to mention no more, the *Saints* in *Heaven* are represented, by *St. John*, cloathed in *white Raiment* (h). Now this *Raiment*, the *Apostle* himself expressly tells us, is the *Righteousness of the Saints* (i). This *Observation*, and these *Authorities* to support it, may serve to explaine the *Words* of *Moses*-----*He cloathed them with Coats of Skins*. For by this *Expression* he might, probably, mean *Sacrifice*, the *Emblem* of what *Isaiah* calls, the *Robe of Righteousness* and the *Garments of Salvation* (k). So that the first *Pair*, by their *Faith* in the *Promise* of *Redemption*, may be properly said, in the *emphatic* *Language* of *St. Paul*, to have put on *Christ* (l). And because *Sacrifice* was of *Divine* *Institution*, *Moses* might, probably, say of these *Cloathings*, that the *Lord God made them*. For they plainly stand opposed to the *Coverings*

(c) *Gen.* iii. 21. (d) xxx. 12. (e) cxxxii. 9. (f) xxix. 14. (g) lix. 17. (h) iv. 4. (i) xix. 8. (k) lxi. 10. (l) *Gal.* iii. 27.

verings of *Figleaves* *, which the *Man and his Wife* had made for Themselves. The *Sabbath* then was now *sanctified* to commemorate the additional Blessing of the new Creation by Christ Jesus ; and *Sacrifice* was likewise appointed, as we might naturally expect, to be the *Symbol* of it. Nor is it possible to conceive a more fit or expressive *Sign* of the thing signified.

C

For

* The Commentators have made a strange puzzle about these *Figleaves*. But the Difficulty, if there be any, may easily be removed. *Moses* tells us, Ch. ii. 25. that the first Pair were *Harumim*, *naked*, and not *ashamed*. This was before the Fall. But after it he tells us, Ch. iii. 7. that they were *Hal-rumim*, and (being conscious of that Nakedness) they twisted *Figleaves* together, and made themselves Aprons. The Reader is desired to take Notice, that in this last Word there is an Addition of a second *Jod*, to express, after the Hebrew Manner, a double Nakedness---a Nakedness of Mind as well as Body. The Question then is, if there can be any Question, Which Nakedness these Coverings were intended to conceal. Now, setting aside Systems, the Answer is obvious. For it plainly appears, that the Use of the *Figleaves* was to hide that Nakedness which they themselves had made, not that which God had made. And indeed no satisfactory Reason can be assigned, why *Cloathing* should be more necessary after their eating a little Fruit, (for that, it seems, was the Crime) than before. Besides, *Adam* confesses, even after he had put on that Covering, that he was still *naked*. V. 10. But how could this be, if his Body was at that time cloathed with *Figleaves*? If indeed they relate to the Mind, the Confession was true, and the Expression proper. For he was (notwithstanding a Kind of Covering of his own devising) really *naked*---*exposed*---having nothing to hide him from the Wrath of an offended God. I conclude therefore (for myself) that these *Figleaves* were to conceal the Nakedness of the Mind. The next Question then is, what we are to understand by the Expression, for it cannot be understood literally. Now the *Olive*, we know, is the Emblem of Peace, the *Palm* of Victory. Why then might not a *Hebrew* (if the Genius of his Language would permit it) put *Figleaves* for Repentance? especially as the Scene was a Garden. *Ireneus*, I am told, gives the same Interpretation. What his Reason was I know not. But the Hebrew Verb *Anah* signifies to rub, fret, and, in a secondary Sense, to grieve. From thence may, probably, be derived *Tanah* the *Figtree*, because of the Roughness and Prickliness of its Leaves, and so may stand in this Place for Contrition, an Expression, by the Way, borrowed from the Body. Here is nothing forced in this Interpretation; and Contrition Branches is as proper an Expression in *Moses*, as *ἐκτενσεις ἡλαδιστον* Supplication Branches in *Sophocles* (Oed. Lin. 3.) Thus then the first *Adam* was girded with a Girdle of Repentance. But of the second it is said, that Righteousness was the Girdle of his Loins, and Faithfulness the Girdle of his Reins. *Isaiah* xi. 5.

For the *Animal* being *substituted*, first for the Body of the *Sinner*, and then for the Body of *Christ*, would be a constant *Memento*, to every pious, rational, Worshipper, of that Life which he hath forfeited, and of that Redemption which he hoped for.

[These Reflexions will appear still more probable, if we consider the History of *Cain* and *Abel*, which contains an Account of their Religious Behaviour on a *Sabbath Day*. *It was in the End of Days*, says the sacred Historian, the last or *seventh* Day of the Week. This is the only *stated* Time of Worship mentioned in the preceding History, and it was the only *stated* Time of Worship, by *Divine* Appointment, before the *Law*. And *Cain* brought of the Fruit of the Ground a *Mincha*, a Present, to *Jehovah*. But *Abel*---He brought ALSO of the Firstlings of his Flock, and of the Fat thereof---. And *Jehovah* had Respect unto *Abel*, and to his *Mincha*, his Present of Fruit; but unto *Cain*, and to his *Mincha*, his Present of Fruit, he had not Respect (a). These two Worshippers appear, at the same *stated* Time, before the true God. The one brings an Offering, of the Fruits of the Ground, as a Sign of his Dependence, and as a Testimony of his Gratitude. And what *Moral Man*, upon the Principles of *Natural Religion*, could have done more! And yet even this was insufficient. Both the Offering and the Offerer were rejected. The other likewise came with the same Sentiments of Gratitude and Dependence, and brought, of the Fruits of the Earth, a Present to his Maker. But conscious of his own Unworthiness, and disclaiming all Pretence of Merit in Himself, he relies entirely on the Promise of God, and brings also the appointed Sacrifice, of the Firstlings of his Flock, in Remembrance of his Redeemer. And then it naturally follows, that *Jehovah* had Respect unto *Abel* and to his *Mincha*, his Fruit Offering. It is commonly thought, that as *Cain* brought only of the Fruits of the Ground, so *Abel* brought

(a) Gen. iv. iii.

brought *only* of the Firstlings of his Flock. But that *Abel* brought a *Present* of *inanimate* Things, as well as an *Animal* Sacrifice, appears, in some Measure, from the very Turn of the Sentence. For how absurd would it be to say of two Persons, who brought different *Gifts*, that the one came with a little *Fruit*, the other *also* with an *Animal*! But we are not left to collect so material a Circumstance merely from the Incertainty of a Conjecture. For the inspired Penman expressly tells us, that God had Respect unto *Abel's Mincha*, that is, his *Present* of *inanimate* Things. He must therefore have brought such an one; for the Term *Mincha* is never used, throughout the whole Bible, for an *Animal* Sacrifice. This Observation entirely destroys the Conceit of those Persons, who have been pleased to affirm, that the Difference of the Oblations was only the accidental Result of their different Occupations. For "It is certain, say they, || that *Cain*, being a *Husbandman*, brought a *Present of the Fruits of his Ground*, but *Abel* the *Shepherd of the Firstlings of his Flock*." But it is plain from the History, that there was not *merely* a Difference in their *Presents*, as they are called. For *Abel* brought what his Brother did, and an *Animal* Sacrifice besides. And indeed without a *Present of the Fruits of the Earth* his *Animal* Sacrifice would have been incomplete. *Both together* made the Service and the Worshipper *perfect*. For *Christianity* was never intended to supersede the Religion of Nature. They must go Hand in Hand. The *Gospel* indeed introduced *new* Obligations, but by
no

|| *Certum est*, Cain et Abel Oblationes diversis eorum Facultatibus et Studiis maxime convenientes obtulisse. Nam Cain Agricola *de Fructu Terra*, Abel autem Pastor *de Primogenitis Gregis*, munus *Jehovæ* attulisse dicitur. *Spencer* pag. 767. I would not have disturbed the Ashes of this venerable Author, (whose illustrious Work *De Legibus Hebræorum* must yield, I think, solid Satisfaction to every Reader of Sense and Candor) had not the late Dr. *Middleton* urged his Authority, as alone sufficient to set aside the Opinion that *animal* Sacrifice was of *divine* Institution. "The learned *Spencer*, says he, who had considered this *Quæstion* as accurately as any Man, expressly rejects it." How accurately he had considered *this* Passage the Reader may judge.

no Means abrogated our *old* ones. The *Creator* was still to be *remembered*, but in Conjunction with the *Redeemer*. And the Man, who is disobedient to the former, cannot raise to himself any well-grounded Hope from his Faith, be it ever so *orthodox*, in the latter. It appears from the whole Tenor of Scripture, that the *Gospel* was not given to oppose, but to assist the Religion of Nature. And for this Reason, probably, St. James styles it *the ingrafted Word, which is able to save our Souls (a.)* It being as it were *inoculated* upon the *old Stock* of natural Religion, which became unable of itself to bring forth Fruit unto Life.

The Expostulation of God with Cain, after his Rejection, confirms this Interpretation. *Then Cain was wroth that his Countenance was cast down. And Jehovah said unto him, why art thou wroth? and why was thy Countenance CAST DOWN? If thou wast Righteous, should it not have been LIFTED UP? and if thou wast not Righteous, was there not a Sin Offering at the Door §? So unto thee would have been his Desire, and thou shouldest have ruled over him (b).* In this Translation (and it is

(a) i. 21.

§ The Word *חטאת* signifies both *Sin* and an *Offering for Sin*. When it stands for *Sin*, the Verb has always, as it regularly ought to have, a *feminine* Termination. Thus *Levit. iv. 14.* When the *Sin* is known, *נודעה חטאת*. But when it stands for a *Sin-offering*, the Verb is put, irregularly, in the *masculine* Gender, as it is in the Passage before us. By *the Door* is not here meant, as is commonly supposed, *Cain's Door*, but the *Door of God's House*. The Whole is related in the Language of the *Law*, and the Sentiment is as *Jewish* as the Expression. To the *Law* then we must go for the Meaning. Now we find in *Leviticus*, that the *Sacrifices* were to be brought to the *Door of the Tabernacle* (not as our Translation says of the *Congregation*, the Assembly of the *People only*, but) of *meeting*, where God met his People. So I find it explained by God himself, *Exod. xxix. 42, 43.* the continual *Burnt offering at the Door of the Tabernacle* *מועד* of Meeting before *Jehovah*, where *נעדרתי* I will meet the Children of Israel. This explains another Circumstance, *from thy Presence shall I be hid*, says Cain to God. And again, *Cain went out from the Presence of Jehovah*: This is what we call *Excommunication*. He was excluded the Assembly of the *Faithful*. He was not to meet God, unless he would meet him in the appointed Manner.

(b) Gen. iv. 6. 7.

is a literal Translation,) every Thing is plane and easy. *Cain* was angry, because God had *abased* him, by setting him aside, and preferring his Brother. God therefore condescended to reason the Matter, to convince him, if possible, of the Equity and Impartiality of his Proceedings. "Why was thy Countenance *cast down*? If thou wast *Righteous*, should it not have been *lifted up*?" If he had been in a State of *Righteousness*, as his *Offering* supposed, God would not have *abased*, but *exalted* him. "And if thou wast *not Righteous*, was there not a *Sin-offering at the Door*? So unto Thee would have been his Desire, and thou shouldst rule over him." Though he was *not* in a State of *Righteousness*, yet upon the Terms of a *Sin-offering*, which was provided, and ready at his Command, he would still have had the *Superiority*, and would have ruled over his Brother. This seems to be the true Sense of the Passage; and if it be allowed to be so, it is an undeniable Proof, that *Animal Sacrifice was of Heaven, and not of Men*. For if *Cain* had brought such an one, he would have retained his Superiority, which was the Right of Primogeniture. But Human Reason could never inform him, that such a Service would be acceptable to the Deity. And yet God expostulates with him, upon the Supposition that he *knew* the Efficacy of a *Sin-offering*. It was therefore of *Divine Appointment*. I must just observe, that the *Original Word*, which I have rendered a *Sin-offering*, is a *Sacrificial Term* in the *Jewish Law*, and God Himself has explained the Use of it in the *fourth Chapter of Leviticus*. *If any one sin, (ver. 27.) then he shall bring a Kid of the Goats or a Lamb (32.) for a Sin-offering, unto the Door of the Tabernacle. And the Priest shall take of the Blood of the Sin-offering, (34.) and shall make an Attonement for his Sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him. (35.)* St. Paul uses the Word (*ἁμαρτία*) *Sin* in the same Sense. *Him, who knew no Sin, He made Sin, that is, a Sin-offering, for Us, that We might be the Righteousness of*

D

God

God BY HIM (a). And this, by the Way, is a convincing Proof, that *Abel's Inanimate Oblation* was accepted for the Sake of his *Animal Sacrifice*. That is, God considered him *as Righteous* for the Sake of *Christ*, the *Real Sin-offering*, of Whom his *Animal Sacrifice* was the *Type* or *Emblem*.

Saint *Paul's* Comment on this Part of Patriarchal History deserves our Attention, and will give additional Strength to the foregoing Interpretation of it. By FAITH *Abel offered unto God* a more excellent Sacrifice *than Cain*; By WHICH he obtained Witness that he was RIGHTEOUS, God testifying (It) upon his GIFTS; and BY IT being DEAD—YET SPEAKETH (b).

Every Circumstance is remarkable. *Abel* offered by Faith. The Term *Faith* is used in a Variety of Senses by the sacred Penmen. To prevent any Mistakes therefore, in a Point of so great Importance, the Apostle has given us a Definition of the Term. It is, he says, *the Substance of Things hoped for, the Evidence of Things not seen*. And, agreeably with this Description, every Person, recorded in the Chapter, acted in Consequence of a *Divine Command*. By Faith, *Noah* being warned of God, prepared the Ark-----*Moses* kept the Pass-over-----and *Abraham* offered up his Son. By the same Faith then [*Faith* in a *Divine Command*] *Abel* brought an *Animal Sacrifice*. From whence I infer, that *Cain* was an *Infidel*. For had He had Faith in the Death of a Redeemer, He would likewise have brought an *Animal Sacrifice*, which was the *instituted Memorial* of It.---By which, by Means of which Sacrifice, He (*Abel*) obtained Witness that he was *Righteous*. He was publicly declared to be in a State of *Righteousness* for the Sake of *Christ*, of whose Death the bloody Sacrifice was a *symbolical Representation*,-----God testifying it upon his Gifts. God publicly gave Testimony to the *Righteousness* of *Abel* by some visible Token, perhaps by a *Flame of Fire*, upon his *Fruit-offering*.
Upon

(a) 2 Cor. v. 21.

(b) Heb. xi. 4.

Upon his *Fruit-offering*, I say, for the *Animal Sacrifice* cannot be reckoned among the Number of his *Gifts* †. The Reason is obvious. Because to presume to offer up the *Blood of Animals*, the *Representative* of the *Blood of Christ*, as a *Gift*, would be, in Effect, taking Part with the unbelieving *Jews*, who crucified the Lord of Life. He himself indeed had a *Power to lay down his Life*, but no Man had a Right to take it from him. His *Friends* were to enjoy the Benefits of his *Blood*, but it could be shed only by his *Enemies*.----And by *It being Dead yet speaketh*. This Circumstance is not applied to *Abel*, in particular, for Nothing. Our Saviour tells us, that *Abel* was a *Prophet* (a). The Apostle says, that he prophesies being *Dead*, and farther, that he does so by *Means* of his *Sacrifice*, and through *Faith in It*. The Subject of his Prophecy then must be *A Resurrection of the Dead through Christ*. For our blessed Master gave his *Life a Ransom for All* (b). *Abel*, looking forward to this *Redemption*, brought an *Animal Sacrifice*. But his *Faith* and his *Sacrifice* were so far from exempting him from *temporal Death*, that they were, accidentally, the Occasion of *It* (c). There must therefore be a *Resurrection of the Dead*; and *Abel*, being *Dead*, prophesies of *It*. For, as the Redeemer says of Himself, *I am the Resurrection and the Life*; *He that believeth in ME, though he were Dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in ME, shall not die For Ever* (d).]

I pro-

† St. *Paul*, throughout this whole Epistle, is very careful in distinguishing between ΔΩΡΑ and ΘΥΣΙΑΙ, *Gifts of inanimate Things*, and *Sacrifices of Animals*. See *Ch. v. 1. viii. 3. ix. 9*. And though the Term Θυσια, which strictly signifies an *animal Sacrifice*, be sometimes used, in a *translated Sense*, for an *inanimate Oblation*, and St. *Paul* himself calls *Cain's Offering* Θυσια, yet neither he nor any other of the Sacred Writers ever puts Δωρον for an *animal* one.

(a) *Luke xi. 50.* (b) *1 Tim. ii. 6.*

(c) *Gen. iv. 9.* *Cain talked with Abel his Brother*——And when they were in the Field he *slew him*. This is the first Instance of *Club-law* in Matters of *Faith* and *private Opinion*. And if the Infidel would consider from what Quarter it arose, it is to be hoped, We should hear no more of his
——Tantum RELIGIO.——

(d) *John xi. 25.*

I proceed now, in the *second* Place, to consider the *Sabbath* as relative to the *Jewish* Dispensation. And here I am to shew, as plainly as the Nature of the Thing will admit, that the *Day* was *changed* for the Use of *that* People, from the *seventh* Day of the *Patriarchal* Week to the *sixth*-----from *Sunday* to *Saturday*.

The *Jewish* Sabbath was evidently founded on a *double* Reason; one *general*, with Respect to a *seventh* Day, as they were the *Sons of Adam*, to shew they worshipped *that* God, who created the World in *six* Days, and *rested* on the *seventh*; the other *peculiar* to Themselves, as *God's chosen People*, to signify their *Deliverance* from the Bondage of *Egypt*, from whence *that seventh* Day was dated. This appears, as we shall see hereafter, from *Exod.* xx. 11. compared with *Deut.* v. 15. It might have been so contrived indeed by Providence, that the *seventh* Day from their *Deliverance* should be precisely the same with *that*, whereon God *rested* from the Works of Creation. "But I do not find, says a great Writer ||, that the Scripture any where says so, (howsoever most People take it for granted) and therefore it may as well be not so." Now we are expressly told, that the *Beginning* of their (*sacred*) *Year* was *changed* from the *Autumnal* to the *Vernal* Equinox, because at that Season God wrought out their *Deliverance* (a.) And therefore the *Beginning* of their *Week*, and consequently their *Day of Rest*, might likewise have been *altered* for the same Reason. That it really was so, and must have been so, will appear by considering the *Necessity* of such a Change.

The *Jews* were to be, in all Respects, a *peculiar People*. During their Stay in *Egypt*, they had contracted all the fashionable Habits of that Idolatrous Nation. But now they were gradually to be weaned from their impure Principles and Practices, *separated* from all Communion and Intercourse with other
People

|| Joseph Mede. (a) *Exod.* xii. 2.

People, and to confine their Religious Adoration to the ONE TRUE GOD. For this Purpose JEHOVAH, who was now their KING as well as their God, enacted severe penal Laws against *Idolatry*; and then framed (as all prudent Legislators would have done) partly in Compliance with *Jewish* Prejudice, and partly in Opposition to *Egyptian* Superstition, a multifarious Ritual of *indifferent* Ceremonies, to prevent their falling into *criminal* ones. If this then was God's Design, as undoubtedly it was, in composing the *Jewish* Service, it is impossible to conceive a more effectual Remedy against *Idolatry*, than *changing the Day of Worship*. Whereas if the same Day was continued for the Worship of the *Creator*, which had hitherto been prostituted to the Service of the *Creature*, the Religion of that *carnal* Generation would have been naturally, and almost necessarily, divided between a *false* God and the *true*. And even while they were *outwardly* paying a *Lip-service* to JEHOVAH, they would in their *Hearts* be turning back again into EGYPT (a).

And, remarkably in Support of the present Argument, God himself expressly informs us by *Ezekiel*, where he is particularly describing the Disposition of his People before, at, and after their Egression, that he gave them *the Sabbath* to be a SIGN between Him and Them. *Wherefore I caused them to go out of the Land of Egypt, and brought them into the Wilderness. And I gave them MY Statutes, and shewed them MY Judgments, which if a Man do he shall even live by them. Moreover also I gave them MY Sabbaths to be a SIGN between Me and Them, that they might know, that I JEHOVAH was their Sanctifier.* Ch. xx. 9. 10. 11. 12. To give this Passage its full Force, it must be observed, that JEHOVAH was the *proper Name* of the *True God*, by which he was distinguished from the *Gods of Egypt*. These *Statutes* and *Judgments* then,
E which

(a) Acts vii. 39.

which God emphatically styles *my* Statutes and *my* Judgments, are so called in Contradistinction to the *Idolatrous* ones of the *Heathens*, those dreadful Rites and Ceremonies, which God sometimes suffered his own People to fall into, as a just Punishment for their Offences. *Wherefore* (that is, *because they did not execute MY Judgments, but despised MY Statutes and polluted MY Sabbaths, 24.*) I gave † *them also* Statutes that were not good, and Judgments, whereby they should not live, (25.) Interpreters indeed have, generally, thought, that by these *last* Statutes and Judgments God meant his *Ceremonial* Laws, and have thereby unwarily exposed their Bible to the Scorn of Infidelity*. But God in *Ver. 11.* of this Chapter, as well as *Levit. xviii. 5.* expressly says of *All his Laws*, and Reason says the same, that the Man who *keeps them shall live by them.* And therefore by these *killing* Statutes He could not possibly intend *his own*, for God cannot contradict Himself. And that he really intended no other than the *Heathen* Statutes and Customs, those *impure* Ceremonies, which were in no Sense *good*, and those *merciless* Rites, whereby they *could not live*, is evident from the Words immediately following. FOR *I polluted them in their own Gifts, in that they caused to PASS THROUGH THE FIRE* (not to JEHOVAH, but to MOLOCH) *All that openeth the Womb, that I might make them desolate, to the End that they might know, that I JEHOVAH—*(was their *Sanctifier*) And therefore by those *Sabbaths* which God emphatically styles *my* Sabbaths, He must likewise mean *those*, which he had given them, at that Time, in Opposition to the *Egyptian* Festivals. For God calls them a *Sign* between Him and his People. But how could the *Weekly Day of Rest* be a *Sign* between JEHOVAH and the
Jews

† The Verb נתן, as every one knows, is frequently used in a *permissive* Sense. It ought to be so understood here. The Holy Martyr Stephen seems to have had this Passage in View *Acts vii. 42.* Then God turned himself, and gave them up to worship the Host of Heaven—Yea, ye took up the Tabernacle of MOLOCH.

* See *Characteristicks*, Vol. 3. 55.

Jews, if the *Egyptians* and other Nations set apart the *same Day* for the Worship of their respective Deities ! It is farther said, that the *Sabbath* was a *Sign* that JEHOVAH was their *Sanctifier*. The *Original Word* signifies, primarily, to *separate*, and then, in a *secondary Sense*, to *sanctify*. And the last Term must necessarily include the Idea of the former. But how could *that seventh Day* be a *Sign* of the *Jews* being *separated* from all other Nations, if those other Nations observed *the same* ! So that if the *Jews* and the *Egyptians*, before the Time of the *Exodus*, observed the antient *Patriarchal Sabbath*, (which there is not the least Shadow of a Reason to doubt of) it necessarily follows, that JEHOVAH, who had *separated* the *Jews* to be a *distinct* People to Himself, must likewise set apart a *peculiar Day* of Worship, as the *Sign* of that *Distinction*. And therefore as the *Jews*, by *resting* every *seventh Day*, declared themselves Worshippers of the *One True God*, who in *six Days* created this wonderful Scene of Things, and *rested* on the *seventh*, so by *resting* on *that seventh*, they likewise declared themselves the Subjects of JEHOVAH, who on *that Day* completed their *Redemption* from the *Bondage of Egypt*.

Having thus seen, from the very Nature of the *Jewish Constitution*, that their *Sabbath* must necessarily have been *altered*, let us now endeavour to find out the Time of it. The Foundation of this Change seems to have been laid at the Institution of the *Passover*. Thus we read *Exod. xii. 14.* *This Day shall be unto you for a Memorial, and you shall keep it a Feast to JEHOVAH by an Ordinance for ever. SEVEN Days shall ye eat unleavened Bread; and in the FIRST Day there shall be a holy Convocation, and in the SEVENTH Day there shall be a holy Convocation to you; no Manner of Work shall be done in them. And ye shall observe the Feast of unleavened Bread, for in || this self same Day have I brought your Armies out of the Land of Egypt; therefore shall ye observe this Day in*
your

|| See Numb. xxxiii. 3.

your Generations by an Ordinance for ever.—*In this first Month, on the fourteenth Day of this Month at Even, ye shall eat no leavened Bread, until the one and twentieth Day of this Month at Even.*

Here we have the *Extremes* of the *Jewish Week*, the *first Day* and the *last Day* of *unleavened Bread*, at the Time of the *Exodus*. For if their *Saturday Sabbath* was the *seventh Day* from their *Deliverance* (as before observed) and the *Day* of their *Deliverance* the *first Day* of *unleavened Bread*, then the *first Day* of *unleavened Bread* must have been *Sunday the fifteenth*, and consequently the *last Day* of *unleavened Bread* would fall upon *Saturday the one and twentieth Day of the first Month*. So that the *seventh Day* from the *Creation* would become the *first* of their *Deliverance*. And thus the very *Day* of their *Deliverance*, from the Bondage of *Egypt* and *Pharaoh*, was the same with *that*, whereon our *Great Redeemer* rose from the Dead, and thereby *delivered Us* from the worse Bondage of *Sin* and *Satan*.---It may not be improper to remark, that the *first Sabbath*, which the *Jews* observed, even as a *distinct People*, was *Sunday, the first Day of unleavened Bread*. And this perhaps was so commanded by God, the better to dispose them for that new Change under the Gospel Dispensation, when the *Jewish Sabbath* was, of Course, to give Place to the *Christian*, which was before it.

The Foundation of this Change was laid, as I observed, at the Institution of the *Passover*, and the *last Day of unleavened Bread* was the *first Saturday Sabbath* which was ever observed. And as God had rendered the *first Day* of *unleavened Bread* remarkable by *beginning* the *Deliverance* of his People, so he rendered the *last* as remarkable by *completing* it. For on the *Morning-watch (a)* of that very Day he overwhelmed the Tyrant, with all his Host, in the red Sea. This was the Reason of the Change, which, however was not fully establis-
ed

(a) Exod. xiv. 23.

ed till the *Jews* came into the Wilderness of *Sin*. But here to convince them that an *Alteration* was intended, and that their late Religious Observation of *Saturday* was not *accidental*, as being the Day of their *Triumph*, or the *last* Day of *unleavened Bread*, (which they might possibly imagine) God was pleased to feed them miraculously, during forty Years, with *Manna*, which *ceasing to fall on every seventh Day* demonstrated that to be their *Sabbath* (a). For it is highly unreasonable to suppose, that God would put Himself to a daily Expenditure of *Miracles*, for *forty Years* together, merely to satisfy such a rebellious Crew with Bread. The whole Account, as it lies in *Exodus*, evidently shews, that *this Sabbath* was a *new Institution*, and that the *Miracle* was granted, as a *Sign*, to convince the *Jews*, that *Moses* and *Aaron* acted in the Name of JEHOVAH. For when the Rulers came and told *Moses*, that the People had gathered *twice as much Bread* on the *sixth Day*, (for he had ordered them to do so without acquainting them with the Reason of it) he replies, *This is what JEHOVAH hath said: TOMORROW (is to be) the Sabbath unto JEHOVAH, bake that ye will bake, and seethe that ye will seethe (to Day); and all that remaneth lay up till the Morning.* Accordingly they did so. Then *Moses* said, eat that to Day, for *THIS DAY (is) the Sabbath to JEHOVAH; to Day ye shall not find it in the Field.* And for the future, *Six Days ye shall gather it, but in the seventh Day (which is to be) the Sabbath, in It there shall be none.* But notwithstanding this Command, *there went out some on the seventh Day to gather, but they found none.* Then JEHOVAH said unto *Moses*, *How long refuse ye to keep my Commandments and my Laws? See! because JEHOVAH hath given you THIS Sabbath, therefore (as a Sign) he giveth You on the sixth Day the Bread of two Days. Let no Man (then) go out of his Place (to gather) on this seventh Day.* These Circumstances are alone sufficient to assure us, that the *Day of Rest* was actually chang-

F

ed.

(a) *Exod. xvi.*

ed at this Time and in this Place. But the sacred Historian has thrown in a Remark which will put the Matter out of all Doubt. *So the People rested, or kept the Sabbath, on THAT Day, THAT seventh†. Which is, to Me at least, a Demonstration, that they had been used to keep it on some other †.*

Let us now consider the *fourth Commandment* itself. The Decalogue is introduced with this general Preface. I JEHOVAH am THY GOD, *who brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage(a).* The *fourth* runs thus---REMEMBER this Day, this Sabbath, *to keep it holy.* Six Days shalt thou labor; *but the seventh is the Sabbath to JEHOVAH.* Those, who have wrote upon this Subject, inform us, that the Word *Remember*, which is placed in the Front of *this* Commandment only, relates to God's *prior* Command to *Adam* to sanctify every *seventh* Day. But, with Submission, it evidently points at their *Deliverance*, and the *Change* consequent thereupon; and is peculiarly adapted to win upon the Affections of that People. REMEMBER *the Day of REST*, says JEHOVAH, *the Day* whereon I destroyed your Enemies, and made You REST from your *cruel Labors*, Remember *THIS Day to keep it holy.* That this is the true Reason of the *Memento*, appears planely from *Deuteronomy*, where the Word *Remember* is removed from the *Head* to the *Body* of the Commandment; and the Reason assigned for their keeping that *particular* Day is not said to be, because God *rested from the Works of Creation*, but because he *redeemed them* out

ביום השביעי †

† Our Blessed Master, I think, has likewise given his Testimony, that the Sabbath was *changed*. *John vii. 22.* "Moses, says he to the *Jews*, gave you *Circumcision*, [not that it is of MOSES, but of the FATHERS] and ye on the Sabbath Day circumsise a Man." The Parenthesis is extremely remarkable, as it has no Connexion with the Argument. And therefore our Saviour, by saying *expresly*, without any Occasion, that *Circumcision* was *not of Moses* but of the *Fathers*, seems to intimate, that the *Saturday Sabbath* was *not of the Fathers* but of *Moses*. (a) *Exod. xx.*

out of *Egypt*. REMEMBER *that thou wast a SERVANT in the Land of Egypt, and that JEHOVAH thy God BROUGHT THEE OUT THENCE, through a mighty Hand, and by a stretched out Arm, THEREFORE JEHOVAH thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath Day (a).* Whence it is very evident, that the *Jews* observed a *seventh* Day as a *Memorial* of their *Creator*, but *THAT seventh* as a *Memorial* of their *Redeemer*.

Give me leave to observe, that the Clause, *Six Days thou shalt Labor*, was as much a Command to the *Jews* to *work* on *those* Days, in Imitation of their *Creator*, as the other Part obliged them to *rest* on the *seventh*, in Imitation likewise of the same *Creator*. In this Sense the *Jews* themselves understood the Precept. And supposing, what has been observed before, that the more effectually to secure the Worship of Himself, God appointed his People a *new* Day of *Rest*, he would necessarily take all possible Care to prevent their Observation of the *old* one. Now nothing would be more likely to promote this good End, than enacting a Law, whereby the People should be enjoined strict *Labor* on *every* Day in the Week but the *seventh*. Thus their former *Sabbath* would be necessarily included in the Six Days of *Labor*. And this Conduct, by the Way, would be an Instance of the Legislator's *Condescension* as well as *Prudence*. I mean, it would effectually abolish the *Religious* Observation of that *particular* Day, without seeming to intend it.

To go on---But the seventh Day is the Sabbath to JEHOVAH thy God; in It thou shalt not do any Work---For in six Days JEHOVAH made Heaven and Earth, the Sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh Day. Wherefore JEHOVAH blessed the SABBATH Day, and hallowed it. Be pleased to observe, that this Commandment enjoins *two* Things.

(a) v. 15. See Exod. xiii. 3.

Things. First, a Day of *Rest* from their *Works*, because God had *rested* from his *Works* of Creation. And, secondly, the *Proportion of Time*, one Day in seven, because God had made the World in *six Days*, and *rested* on the *seventh*. This is all that can be infered from the Commandment; for it is called the *seventh* Day only in Respect of the *six* Days of *Labor*, which are mentioned with it. Be pleased to observe farther, that it is not said here, as it was at the Institution of the *Patriarchal Sabbath*, that because God made the World in *six Days*, and *rested* on the *seventh*, therefore he *blessed* the SEVENTH Day and *sanctified* it, but because he made the World in *six Days*, and *rested* on the *seventh*, therefore he *blessed* the SABBATH Day, (the Day of *Rest*) and *sanctified* it. This Variation could not happen by Chance, for they are the Words of God Himself. Nor was it made, I presume, without the highest Reason. Now what tolerable Reason can be assigned for so remarkable an *Alteration* in the *Expression*, but the *Alteration* of the *Day*! Then indeed the Propriety and the Necessity of it immediately appear. For if it had been said, Because God *rested* on THE *seventh* Day, therefore he *blessed* THE *seventh* Day, it might have led the *Jews* to conclude, that *this* Sabbath of theirs was precisely the same with *that*, whereon God *rested* from the Works of Creation. And therefore, as an *Alteration* of the *Day* was the only Thing, which could occasion the *Alteration* in the *Expression*, the *Alteration* of the *Expression* proves the *Alteration* of the *Day*.— I must remark, that as the *Saturday Sabbath* commenced with the *Passover*, so they expired together. For Christ, when he said, IT IS FINISHED, pronounced the Dissolution of the *Jewish* Oeconomy. Accordingly it is observed by the Evangelists, that, immediately upon our *Saviour's* *expiring*, the *Veil* of the *Temple* was rent in twain from the *Top* to the *Bottom* (a).

Hence

(a) Matt. xxvii. 51.

Hence we discover the true Reason, why the *Christian* Church, from the Beginning, set apart that particular Day, which we observe at present, as a *Memorial* of God's *first* Creation, and likewise of the *new* Creation by *Christ Jesus*. For the Partition-wall between *Jew* and *Gentile* being now broken down, and they *Twain* made *One in Christ*, the original *Patriarchal-sabbath*, which had been long buried under the Rubbish of *Jewish* Ceremonies, *revived* with Him who was the *Lord* of it. And therefore the beloved Disciple emphatically calls it the *Lord's Day* (a). Why our blessed Redeemer *rose* again on *that* Day, (and, he informs us, it *behooved* him to do so) will appear in the

Third and last Place, where I promised to consider the *Sabbath* as relative to the *Christian* Dispensation. But, after what has been already said concerning the *Patriarchal* Sabbath, nothing remanes to be added under this Head. For the Substance of the *Patriarchal* and *Christian* Dispensations is the same, and the only Difference between Us and Them is, that they *prefigured* what we *commemorate*. I shall therefore inquire into the *Propriety* and *Necessity* of our Saviour's *rising on this Day*.

Our Blessed Lord had often told his Disciples, while he was yet with them, that he would *rise* from the Dead *the third Day*. Hence they could not but entertain some faint Hope, that he would accomplish his Promise, and come again to them. They had seen him call forth *Lazarus* from the Tomb, and therefore they might rationally conclude, that the same Power would likewise raise *Himself*. But however this be, we find *Ten* of them actually assembled *on that very Day*, *wishing* at least, if not *expecting*, his Appearance; and perhaps the more obstinate Infidelity of the other was the Rea-

G

son

(a) *Rev.* i. 10.

son of *his* Absence. Here their Hopes were raised afresh, and the News of their Master's *Resurrection*, which they had heard before from the *Women* and *Peter*, was again confirmed by the Evidence of two Eye-witnesses, who had eaten and conversed with him. While they were thus employed, sometimes believing, and sometimes doubting, *Jesus Himself stood in the Midst of them, and said, (in Consequence of his Resurrection) PEACE be unto you. But they were affrighted, supposing they had seen a Spirit. Then he said unto them, Why are ye troubled, and why do Reasonings arise in your Hearts? Behold these my very Hands, and these my very Feet, that it is I Myself (that same Jesus who was crucified.) HANDLE me and SEE, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have. Then he shewed them THE Hands and THE Feet (still bearing the Mark and Print of the Nails.) And while they (even) yet believed not for Joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any Meat? And they gave him a Piece of a broiled Fish and of a Honey-comb. And he took it and did EAT before them. (a).---*Having thus removed every Doubt, banished every Fear, and given them the strongest Assurances, which the warmest Believer could desire, or the coolest Infidel demand, of the Truth and Certainty of his *Resurrection*, from the Evidence of *Sense*, he then appeals to that of the *Scriptures*, and to their own *Reason*, next to Himself, the best Interpreter of them. *These are the Words, says he, that I spake unto You, that all must be fulfilled, which are written of Me in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms.* He first convinces them, that *he was risen*, and next informs them *why he was risen. He opened their Understandings that they might understand the Scriptures.* He took the Veil from their Understandings, and from *the Face of Moses* and the *Prophets*, that they might discern the *bidden Sense*, the *spiritual Design* and *Intention* of the *Scriptures*; and said unto them, *Thus it is written, and thus it BEHOVED the Christ to suffer, and to*
rise

rise from the Dead the THIRD Day *. These Words seem to be an Inference drawn from his own Interpretation of the Scriptures. As if he had said, " Thus it appears from the Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, not only that *the Christ* was to *suffer*, and to *rise* from the Dead the *third Day*, but likewise that it *behoved* him, from the Reason and *Fitness* of Things, to do so." Now as this Divine Instructor begun at the *Law of Moses*, we can scarce imagine, that he would omit so material a Part as the Story of *the Fall*, which is indeed the very Ground-work and Foundation of the whole Bible. We may therefore reasonably suppose, that he would now let them into the true *spiritual* Design of the *Garden of God*----of the *two* emblematical *Trees* of LIFE and

* Our Saviour did not mean, for, I presume, he could not mean, that it behoved him to *rise*, indifferently, on any *third Day*, but that as he *died* on *Friday*, it *therefore behoved* him to *rise* on the *third Day* following, which was *Sunday*. And no substantial Reason can be assigned for the *Propriety* or *Necessity* of his *rising* on *that Day*, unless the *first Adam* had *fallen* on the *same*. Mr. *Mede* indeed offers another Reason; That as *Christ* was not to see *Corruption*, He must necessarily be *raised* on the *third Day*. This Observation he endeavours to support by an Expression in the *Gospel*, and by a Rule of the *Physicians*. His first Proof is drawn from *John xi. 39.* where *Jesus* commanding the Stone to be taken away from the Grave of *Lazarus*, *Martha* interrupts him with—*Lord, by this Time he stinketh, FOR he has been Dead*—FOUR Days. But this proves nothing; for the *Original* [τεταρταριος γαρ ηστι] ought to be rendered, *He has been—buried—four Days*; (see *Ver. 17*) so that, probably, he might have been *dead five Days*, unless we suppose, that his Sisters hurried him to the Grave the very Moment he died. Nor is any greater Stress to be laid on his Rule in *Physic*, " That those, who die of *Apoplexies*, or other *sudden Deaths*, should not be buried till *seventy two Hours* [three whole Days] were *past*; because"—But our Saviour was not *dead* but little more than *half* that Time; and so there was no Occasion for his *rising* on the *third Day* [within *six and thirty Hours* after his Death] only to prevent his Body from seeing *Corruption*, which, as this learned Writer himself confesses, would not *begin to corrupt* till after *seventy two Hours* were *past*. Besides, had he laid a *whole Week* in the Grave, was not God bound by Promise to *prevent* the *Corruption* of his Body? If you say, God would not interpose *miraculously*, when acting agreeably with *Nature* was sufficient, I refer you to the Case of *Lazarus*, just now mentioned, as an Instance to the contrary.

and DEATH---that he would give them some Account of the *Person* represented by, and emphatically styled, THE *Serpent*---of the *Nature* of the *Fall*, and of the *Time* of it. All which Particulars *Moses* might have many Reasons for throwing into *Shade*. We may conclude then, by considering the Correspondence between the *Time* of the *Fall* and that of the *Redemption*, that the *first Adam* fell into the *Dust of Death* the same *Day* of the *Week* on which the *second* revived, abolished *Death*, and brought *Life* and *Incorruption* to *Light*.

This Opinion will appear still more probable, if we call to mind a remarkable Passage in St. *John*. *Ye are*, says our Saviour to the *Jews*, who were at that *Time* going about to kill him, *of your Father the Devil, and the Lusts of your Father ye will do*-----He was a Murderer from THE BEGINING, or as it is rendered by the *Syriac* Translation, (which Language our Saviour spoke) from *In the Beginning* (a). Here he unquestionably alludes to the *Mosaic* Account of the *Fall*, and by saying, that the *Devil* destroyed or murdered *Adam* from *The Beginning*, he plainly points out the very *Day* of it. For this was a very common and familiar Phrase among the *Jews*, whereby they expressed the *first Week* of the *World*. It is evidently borrowed from the Book of *Genesis*, where the sacred Historian informs us of *God's* Proceedings *In the Beginning*, which he afterwards divides into *seven Days*. The *Jews* then, who heard these Words, must certainly have supposed the Speaker to mean, that the *Devil* murdered *Adam* either on the *sixth Day* §, the *Day of his Creation*, (as some have fondly imagined)

(a) viii. 44.

§ This was the Opinion of the *Jewish* Church, and the *Seventy* seem to have been the Authors of it, as appears from a remarkable *Addition* in their Version of *Job* xiv. 4. *Who can bring a clean Thing* (says the *Hebrew* Text) *out of an unclean? Not one.* After which the *LXX* have been pleased to add, *Though his Life be but of ONE DAY.* Some Christian Writers, not considering

imagined) or on the *seventh*. But our Saviour could not affirm, that *Adam* fell on the *sixth* Day, because at the Conclusion of *that* Day God looked back, with Pleasure, on his *Works*, for *behold!* they were *very good*. He must therefore have fallen on the *seventh*. And hence we discover the *Fitness*, *Propriety*, and *Expediency*, of the Redeemer's rising on *that* Day----that on the *same* Day, in which we died in *Adam*, we might be made *alive* in *Christ*.

Upon the whole it appears, " That the True Religion, instituted by God, has been *one* and the *same* from the Fall of *Adam*, subsisting ever upon the *same* Principles of Faith;" and that *Christianity*, or the *Mediatorial* Scheme, is *as Old as the Creation*. It appears farther, that the *Sabbath* was *instituted before* the Fall, *renewed after* it, and has continued the *same*, without Interruption, in the Church of God, (excepting the Period of the *Jewish* Dispensation) from that Day to the present; and will, we trust, continue, untill it be finally swallowed up and lost in that EVERLASTING REST, *which remaneth for the People of God* (a).

H

Let

considering that the *Jews* might have a Turn to serve by that Remark, have embraced the same Opinion. The great *Lightfoot* evidently saw, that there must be a strict Correspondence between the Time of the *Fall* and that of the *Redemption*. His Rule was right, but, misled by the *Jews*, he erred in the Application of it. For he supposes, that *Adam* transgressed on *Friday*, the *sixth* Day of the Week, because *Christ* was crucified on *that* Day. Here this learned Man was guilty of two Mistakes, one in *Chronology* and another in *Divinity*. For the Reader, I presume, is satisfied by this Time, that *Saturday* was the *sixth* Day of the *Patriarchal* Week, and the Day on which *Adam* was created. And so the Doctor's *Analogy* ceases. But I must take the Liberty to say farther, that our Saviour's *Death* was not alone and of itself the Cause of our *Redemption*. The Scriptures indeed frequently remind us of the exceeding great Love of *Christ* in *dying for us*. But they tell us likewise, agreeably with Reason, that the true Value and Efficacy of his *Death* was owing to his *Resurrection*. For Our *Resurrection* was the Consequence of His. And therefore a *dead Christ* would have been of no more Use to us, than a *dead Adam*. St. Paul is my Author. *If Christ be not RISEN, Ye are yet in your Sins*. I Cor. xv. 17.

(a) Heb. iv.

Let us therefore *remember* the *Sabbath* Day to *keep it holy*.
 —Not forsaking the assembling Ourſelves together, (as the Manner of Some is) but chearfully embracing every *ſtated* Time of going into the Houſe of God, and telling out his Works with Gladneſs. This is our Duty and our Privilege here, as it will be our Employment and Happineſs hereafter. Let us then, while we are here below, join in the Words, and, if poſſible, in the *Devotion*, of the Saints above---*Worthy art Thou, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honor, and Power, for Thou haſt CREATED ALL THINGS. And Again, Worthy is the LAMB, that was SLAIN, to receive Power, and Honor, and Glory and Bleſſing, for Thou haſt REDEEMED Us to God by thy Blood, out of EVERY Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation. And therefore, Bleſſing, and Honor, and Glory, and Power, be unto HIM THAT SITTETH ON THE THRONE, and to THE LAMB FOR EVER AND EVER.-----AMEN.*

F I N I S.



